



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE AGENDA **Minutes**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2005

**LOCATION: CAUCUS ROOMS
CARMEL CITY HALL
ONE CIVIC SQUARE
CARMEL, IN 46032**

**TIME: 6:00 P.M.
DOORS OPEN AT 5:30 P.M.**

Those present:

Representing the Committee:

Kevin Heber
Dianna Knoll
Rick Ripma
Susan Westermeier

Representing the Department:

Christine Barton-Holmes
Angie Conn

Of Counsel:

John Molitor

Rick Ripma called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

The Subdivision Committee will meet to consider the following items:

- 1. Docket No. 05100030 ADLS Amend: One Penn Mark – Wall Signage**
The applicant seeks approval to install a second wall sign at the site to face US 31 (this installation will require variances).
The site is located at 11595 N. Meridian Street and is zoned B6 and is within the US 31 Overlay.
Filed by Steve Granner for Zeller Realty Group.

Present for the Petitioner: Steve Granner representing Zeller Realty Group.

Petitioner's Presentation: Steve Granner noted that he was a zoning consultant with offices located at 600 E. 96th Street, suite 500. He said that he was representing the Zeller Realty Group. He said that One Penn Mark is the office building located on the Southeast corner of Meridian and Pennsylvania. He said that Meridian was on the West, Pennsylvania is on the East, and 116th Street is on the North. He noted that the building has two signs on the building currently. He said that Angie Conn had handed the Committee members color photographs. He said that East façade, which faces Pennsylvania, is entitled to a sign, but currently has none. He said that the Campbell, Kyle, & Proffitt sign is on the North façade. He noted that Oak Street Mortgage is on the West façade. Steve Granner said that what the petitioner is requesting to do is to transfer the rights of the Pennsylvania Street side sign to the Meridian Street side for a second sign on Meridian Street. He noted that the petitioners have filed a variance, which will be heard later in the month. He said that the petitioners did not have a drawing of what the sign will look like because they don't know. He said that the petitioner is negotiating with a new tenant. He said that what they are trying to do on this building is a smaller scale than what they have done on some of the other buildings. He said that the petitioner has recently done this with the Meridian Mark buildings, the two buildings on the North side across the street from this site. He said he recently did this for the two new buildings that Lauth is going to build on the East side of Meridian along 465. He said that in this case the petitioners already have two signs on the building, so he said that they were only doing a mini sign program for a potential location on the Meridian Street side. He noted that tab 4 in the Committee members' booklets describes what the sign colors and materials are going to be. He noted that the color and materials would be the same as the Oak Street Mortgage sign. He said that it will look very similar to that sign but that it would have a different name and a different font style. He said that the petitioners think that the company name is going to be American Partner's bank. He said that they are apparently merging with someone or buying another company out or something. He said that the petitioner's think that the name in the sign is going to be American Partner's bank, but he said that the petitioner is not one hundred percent sure. He said that he doesn't know if the name will change after the transaction and that he doesn't know if there will be a logo included with the letters. He said that what the petitioners have asked for with the variance is to move the sign to the other location on the building and materials and colors would be as stated on tab four. He said that the petitioners have asked in the variance to figure the logo and the letters separately, rather than one rectangle around the entire thing. He noted that they did that recently on the sign package for those two Lauth office buildings. He said that he went back and checked and he said that the lettering on the Parkwood buildings were figured separately from the logos. He said that they would be asking the Board of Zoning Appeals to figure the signage the same way.

Rick Ripma called for comments from the public. There were none.

Rick Ripma called for staff comments.

Angie Conn said that the Department Report states that there were some issues with not getting sign details, but she said that the Department is comfortable with having these specifications with the color and the lighting that it will be the same as the other wall sign. She said that there was one concern about taking the square footage of the text and the logo. She said that Staff wants the petitioner to verify the maximum distance that the logo would be from the text, so that there is not a situation where a logo is largely separated from the text, but still counts as one sign. Angie Conn said that if that question is answered, then the Department recommends the Committee approve this request.

Rick Ripma clarified that the Staff wanted the petitioner to answer the question now.

Steve Granner said that the petitioner would agree to any reasonable standards that the Staff would suggest for maximum distance.

Angie Conn suggested a maximum of five feet. She said that when a sign permit is pulled it wouldn't look awkward on the building.

Steve Granner said that the petitioner agreed to that.

Rick Ripma asked if the petitioner's lose the ability to display a sign on Pennsylvania if this sign is approved.

Angie Conn replied that that was correct.

Rick Ripma asked how much larger the proposed sign is than what is allowed.

Steve Granner responded that the size of the sign that they are proposing is the size that would be allowed on the Pennsylvania street frontage.

Rick Ripma asked how that compared to the Oak Street Mortgage sign.

Steve Granner said that he was not exactly sure how big the Oak Street Mortgage sign was. He said that the square footage would be more than would be permitted on the Meridian Street frontage.

Dianna Knoll clarified that it was both signs' square footage combined.

Steve Granner said that the Oak Street Mortgage sign was limited to 70 square feet based on the width of the building and the distance from the right of way. He said that the ordinance allows larger signs on the streets away from Meridian, like 116th Street and Pennsylvania Parkway, than it does for signs facing Meridian. He said that, historically, what he thinks has been allowed in the corridor is to transfer the square footage around to Meridian as long as it didn't exceed the total square footage allowed for all the signs. He said that the petitioner is just trying to transfer those 105 square feet from Pennsylvania to Meridian. He noted that the sign may not be that big because he said that the signs that have gone up around are very small and understated signs. He said that the petitioners wanted to leave as much flexibility as possible because they weren't sure what the logos would do.

Angie Conn said that there was a different sign chart for those roads that are not highways. She said that it tells square footage.

Rick Ripma asked if it was common to move them around. He asked if it was common to move the whole size and everything. He noted that the Oak Street sign had to be a smaller size than what we would allow if we moved this one around.

Angie Conn said that was correct, but noted that the Committee could also approve the sign with the stipulation that it could only be what is allowed on the Meridian frontage.

Susan Westermeier said that she doesn't think it would be fair to Oak Street Mortgage that the other person could come in with a larger sign. She said that she thinks that it has to be the same size. She asked whether

Oak Street Mortgage met the requirements on the size of the sign.

Angie Conn said that she thinks so. She said that the Committee could approve the sign with the restriction that it would have the maximum square footage the sign chart lists for highways, so it would have the same square footage requirements as the Oak Street Mortgage sign, rather than the square footage requirements for Pennsylvania.

Susan Westermeier asked if the square footage calculations included the logo.

Angie Conn said that was correct but that the variance that the petitioner is requesting would calculate the square footage separately where you would put a box around the text and a box around the logo, calculate them separately, and then add them together.

Rick Ripma asked if the City had any problems with them doing it that way.

Angie Conn said that the City did not.

Rick Ripma called for any other questions.

Dianna Knoll made formal motion to approve Docket Number 05100030 ADLS Amend: One Penn Mark-Wall Signage with the conditions that it conforms to the size requirements for being along Meridian Street, subject to the BZA approval of the petitioner's variance for the text and logo square footage to be calculated separately and then added together, and with a maximum separation of five feet between the text and the logo.

The motion was seconded and **APPROVED 4-0.**

...END...

Rick Ripma said that the Department Reports indicated that there were items missing and he wanted to know if that was due to the fact that last time the Plan Commission asked that the items be completed.

Angie Conn replied that it was related to the change in policy and if the petitioner hasn't submitted everything that they are supposed to, the department will ask that the item be tabled to the next meeting.

Rick Ripma asked if these items were kind of caught in the transition.

Angie Conn responded yes. She said that some of the Staff recommendations have changed in the past couple of days. She said that she would get to that when they got to the item.

Rick Ripma said that he just wanted to make sure because he thought that the Committee might not even hear the items, but he thought that wasn't fair to the petitioners if they are caught in the middle of it. He said that he thought they should go ahead and hear the items.

2. Docket No. 05100031 ADLS Amend: West Carmel Marketplace - Best Buy Signage

The applicant seeks approval for new wall signage and a building frontage alteration.

The site is located at 9901 Michigan Rd and is zoned B-3 in the US 421 Overlay.

Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale for Duke Construction, LP.

Present for the Petitioner: Annemarie Varga with Bingham McHale, Rodney Reinhart, and Cindy Schembre both with Duke Construction.

Petitioner's Presentation: Annemarie Varga said that the petitioners have requested an amendment to the ADLS that was approved back in September of last year. She noted that it had gone through one amendment already when the Marshall's went in. She said there was a façade change. She said that it went before the Special Studies Committee. She said that the Special Studies committee had actually voted that when the minor façade changes came through that they would be handled administratively. She said that after Staff reviewed what the petitioners were proposing with the Best Buy and, because a new element was being added to the building, Staff suggested that it go back through the Committee. She noted that the item was being heard by the Subdivision Committee because the Special Studies Committee had a really full agenda. She said that the changes to the façade that are being proposed tonight are that the Best Buy and the Petco are actually flipping from the original approval and the Best Buy has the addition of a tower of sorts on the South side of the building. She said that in addition to that Best Buy is proposing something a little different than what was approved as part of the original ADLS. She said that they are still doing the white letters, which are within the size parameters of the ADLS. She said that they are actually showing their Best Buy ticket. She noted that it was not part of the sign itself, that it was separated and placed on the tower. She said that if you are familiar with Best Buy stores then you know that they usually do a big yellow ticket with a blue wedge. She said that they are not proposing that here. She said that the ticket will be white. Ms. Varga said that they are requesting variances to allow number of signs because they are showing four signs total—two on the front and two on 99th street, and area of signs. She said that if you take area measurements of the signs, they equal a total of 288.4 square feet and only 225 square feet were permitted per tenant by the last variance that was approved for this project. She said that there is a variance request in for number of signs and for area. She pointed out that the area per frontage for Best Buy for the signs is only 144.2 square feet, so it's well below, but because they have the two signs on the two frontages, it does exceed what was approved for them. She said that they are showing the signs on 99th street. She said that was not part of the original ADLS. She noted that the original ADLS did not have any signs fronting on 99th Street. She said that would require a change to the written commitments, which Duke has also filed for this project. She said that in addition to the signs and the slight change in the façade. She said that Best Buy is proposing a spotlight out in the parking lot and she said that she would allow the developer to talk a little bit more about that and its purpose and why they are requesting that.

Rodney Reinhart handed out updated elevations. He said that the frontage of it had not changed, but that it was just a more accurate and detailed. He said that on the lighting, in the back of the Committee packet is a photometrics plan. He said that what that is showing is that there are two light poles adjacent to the Best Buy that they would like to place flood lights on the top of those light poles. He said that there would be flood lights on the top of those two light poles that would shine on the face of Best Buy. He said that on the building parapet, the lowest point is 25 feet and that all the poles because of the 421 overlay are a maximum of 24 feet tall at the top. He said that they still would be below the parapet height of the building.

Rick Ripma called for public comments.

Seeing none, Rick Ripma called for Staff comments.

Angie Conn said that the staff has no outstanding issues and that they recommended that the Committee approve the request.

Kevin Heber asked why the petitioners could not do lighting on the façade.

Rodney Reinhart responded that it was really tough to get wall sconces that give the same look as the flood lights shining on the building.

Cindy Schembre responded that in some regards, having gone to this design, after several months of discussion with Staff and with Best Buy, this is sort of a compromise that the petitioners have come to with Best Buy to have the smaller white letters and the smaller white tag.

Rick Ripma commented the lighting plan doesn't show where the light goes. He noted that right behind the building in a residential area.

Rodney Reinhart noted that the nearest residential home is several hundred feet away. He reiterated that the light poles were shorter than the building itself. He also said that the light would be shown down.

Rick Ripma asked if the light poles were taller than the building.

Rodney Reinhart responded that the building was taller than the light poles by a foot at the lowest parapet elevation.

Rick Ripma clarified that the flood lights would be pointed down.

Rodney Reinhart responded that they would be pointed down slightly.

Rick Ripma commented that he was kind of hoping that they could see a plan that would show where the light is going to go. He said that he doesn't want to cause a problem for the people behind the building.

Rodney Reinhart said that the people behind wouldn't be able to see any direct light, which is typically where there is a problem.

Dianna Knoll asked what the store's hours of operation were going to be.

Cindy Schembre responded that they would be normal Best Buy hours, until nine or ten during the week and until ten or eleven on the weekends.

Dianna Knoll noted that it could be a safety issue too.

Rick Ripma asked about the hours of operation of the lights. He wanted to know if they were going to be on all night or if they shut off.

Cindy Schembre said that they would shut off by ten or eleven.

Rick Ripma asked if the petitioners were requesting more signage than what was allowed on the Michigan side of the building.

Annemarie Varga clarified that the original ADLS allowed each tenant 225 square feet of signage. She said that each façade of the Best Buy will have only 144.2 square feet, but that the total square footage when added together would be more than the 225 square feet originally allowed by the ADLS.

Leo Dierkmann asked if this type of lighting concept had ever been used in Carmel before.

Angie Conn said not that she was aware of. She suggested that maybe some car dealers had used this type of lighting to shine on their inventory.

Susan Westermeier said that it seems to her that it is a matter of setting precedence. She commented that if Best Buy gets this sort of lighting approved, will someone else come in wanting that sort of lighting scenario?

Kevin Heber said that it seemed to him that it was a light pollution issue. He said that for him, that is what it seemed to be.

Discussion ensued about the timeline of the original ADLS approval.

Dianna Knoll said that she thought that Kevin had made a good point about light pollution.

Susan Westermeier asked if the Committee members felt like they would be setting any sort of precedent. She said that she, personally, likes lighting at night when you are going in and out of a store. She said that she is a proponent of it.

Kevin Heber said you can fix the safety issues with downward facing lights. He said that he is just not feeling any sympathy for Best Buy. He said that it is a fine store, but that this is Carmel.

Susan Westermeier noted that part of it is a safety issue.

Cindy Schembre said that part of it is safety in that there aren't very many other stores where you are going to shop at where someone will walk out with a very small bag that contains eight hundred dollars worth of electronic equipment in it. She said that it's how Best Buy builds their buildings with extra security features because this is one of those issues that they have. She said that she understands the concerns, but the way that it's been designed, the petitioner hopes to keep it from doing anything but lighting the front of their store.

Rodney Reinhart said that without the flood lights the average foot-candle is about 3. He said that Best Buy requires an average of five, which is another reason they have requested the floodlights.

Rick Ripma asked Angie Conn if the City of Carmel required three.

Angie Conn responded that the only thing the City requires is a limit at the property line.

Discussion ensued regarding the determination of the foot-candle size.

Rick Ripma called for any additional questions.

Dianna Knoll asked if the Committee was supposed to discuss the façade or building alteration as well. She commented that she was okay with it.

Rick Ripma agreed saying that he felt that the façade alteration only enhanced the appearance of the building.

Dianna Knoll made formal motion to approve docket number 05100031 ADLS Amend: West Carmel Marketplace—Best Buy Signage.

Kevin Heber asked if the motion included everything.

Dianna Knoll clarified the motion as including the façade, signage, and spotlights.

Susan Westermeier seconded the motion.

The motion was **APPROVED** with **(3) three in favor**, and **(1) one opposed** (Heber).

...END...

3. **Docket No. 05080016 PP, 05080017 SW, 05080018 SW: Windsor Grove 2**
The applicant seeks to plat 30 lots on 30.056 acres with the following subdivision waivers:
Docket No. 05080017 SW: 6.03.19 – Access to Arterials, Parkways, and Collectors
To seek relief from houses fronting collector streets/200 foot required separation from collector streets.
Docket No. 05080018 SW: 6.03.21 – Points of Access
To seek relief from providing 2 points of access into the subdivision.
The site is located at 3105 106th St. West and is zoned S1.
Filed by Brian Robinson of Stoeppelwerth and Assoc. for Steve Wilson Inc.

Present for the Petitioner: Steve Wilson with Steven A. Wilson, Inc. and Brian Robinson with Stoeppelwerth and Associates.

Representing the Public: Jeff Scripture with Harrison & Moberly, Susan Carlock of and Carrie Harris of

Petitioner's Presentation: Steve Wilson said that he was back again regarding the Windsor Grove II subdivision. He said that they had redesigned the site with a second entrance into the subdivision and another street connecting into the existing stub-in street. He said that this design was his second choice. He said that he still preferred the original design. He noted that the Committee required that the petitioner make the changes. He said that the wall and everything mirrors what was already done in Windsor Grove. He said that the second entrance would have another gatehouse with a boulevard coming down through there. He said that there was an existing pond with another two proposed. He said that the only variance that would be required for this design would be a variance from the two hundred feet clearance. He said that there is one lot that is

sixty feet short of meeting the two hundred foot requirement. He said that with this layout that is the only variance that they would need. He said that they virtually have everything signed off, except for the landscaping plan. He noted that Scott Brewer had had the plan for a few weeks and was still reviewing it. He presented the Committee a copy of the landscaping plan that had been submitted to Scott Brewer. He said that the landscaping pretty much matched what was in Windsor Grove I. He said that he feels that the landscaping plan should suit Scott Brewer.

Rick Ripma called for general public comments favorable.

Seeing none, Rick Ripma called for organized remonstrance unfavorable.

Jeff Scripture with Harrison & Moberly, offices located at 11611 North Meridian Street Suite 150, said that he represented a number of the property owners in Windsor Grove. He provided the Committee members with a list of the property owners in Windsor Grove that he represents. He said that the last time that he was here the submittal was significantly different. He said that the original plan did not have an entrance off of 106th Street. He stated that that was the primary concern of his clients that the only access was going to be through Titan Run. He said that is obviously an issue, which has been addressed by the developer. He said that he had not really had an opportunity to review the new plans with his clients. He said that he did not get a copy of them until the middle of last week. He said that he had submitted the new plans to his clients, but that he had not had much opportunity to get feedback from his clients. The only issue that he feels is remaining in the previous talks he has had with his clients is the slowing of the traffic as it goes through the subdivision. He said that he has not had an opportunity to look at any of the landscaping plans. He said that it wasn't filed in the Department files, but he is hopeful that those issues will be resolved. He said that it looks as if the redesign deals with the major concerns of his clients of having all of these homes enter and exit through section one. He said that he is sure that there is still some concern about the traffic because of the curvy nature of Titan Run. He said that this plan is obviously better than the one presented before. He said that he would ask that he have some additional time to review the redesigned plans with his clients. He said that he had asked the developer to provide him with a copy of the redesigned plan. He said that the developer did not do so. He stated that he had to go to the City of Carmel Planning Department and copy the plans. He said that is what slowed down his opportunity to meet with his clients quite a bit. He said that his thought is that the matter could be tabled or continued for another month. He said that he understood, in talking to Matt Griffin, that the recommendation of staff was going to be to table or continue the item another month. He said that it would make sense to give his clients a little more time to look at all the plans thoroughly to make sure that there are no outstanding issues.

Rick Ripma called for general public comments unfavorable.

Susan Carlock, a homeowner in Windsor Grove, said that her biggest concern with the two entrances is the safety of the children in the neighborhood. She said that she was especially concerned about the safety of her child, who had been approached by a stranger in the past. She said in her mind there was hope that the subdivision would eventually be a gated community. She said that with two entrances she feels that that would be a little more difficult, if not nearly impossible. She said that she thought it would add financial constraints to the homeowners. She said if they were to have one entrance, she felt it would be more feasible to have sixty-six homeowners to contribute towards the gate versus just the thirty-six on their side of the subdivision. She said that being said, she thinks at one time she had signed the petition because she was misled by one of the homeowners as to why she was to sign the petition. She said that she hopes that her name has been taken off of it at this point and time. She said that there are people who are coming through the

neighborhood looking for the people on the petition who pro players. She said that the traffic is quite burdensome. She said that is yet another reason why it would be nice to have just one entrance with the possibility to have that as a gated entrance.

Carrie Harris, another Windsor Grove resident, said that she feels that they were misled by the group that is being represented by the attorney. She said that she also signed the petition when she was misled by these people. She said that they were told that it was because they did not want construction vehicles going where their children play. She said that she agrees with that one hundred percent. She said that Mr. Wilson has said that there would be a separate construction entrance. She said that it makes sense to her to keep it as one neighborhood. She said that is what they envisioned at the beginning. She said that they talked to Steve Wilson about it a year or two ago. She said that Steve was forthcoming about what he planned on doing then. She said that it just seems that all of this happened all of a sudden and that the residents had not heard enough about what was going on. She said that she and Ms. Carlock both are in favor of plan one. She said they are in favor of one entrance and don't feel that their voices are being heard. She said that there are other people, besides themselves, in their subdivision, that agree with the one entrance proposal. She said that she just wants the Committee to keep in mind that there are many people in the subdivision who think that one entrance is okay and she noted that the fire department has approved the plans for a single entrance.

Rick Ripma called for the petitioner's rebuttal.

Steve Wilson said that he did get an email or a fax from the attorney regarding the redesigned plans. He said in the email or fax that he would contact Mr. Wilson about a time to come by and get some information. He said that he never heard any more from the attorney, so he assumed that the attorney had received the information he was wanting from the City of Carmel. He said that the project has already been delayed thirty days. He said that he would like to get the process going. He reiterated that he really does prefer the single entrance. He said that he was kind of forced by the Committee to do the second entrance design. He said that to get the project going, he needs to get a decision one way or the other. He said that he doesn't know how the Committee stands on it. He asked how it works with there being two potential plans.

John Molitor responded that the ordinance requires two access points. He noted that the Committee could grant a waiver as long as the result of the waiver is a design that is better with one point than what you have with two points and doesn't create a public safety issue.

Susan Carlock asked if the Committee had taken into consideration the surrounding communities that have only one entrance and are gated communities. She listed off Cotton Wood, Laurel Wood, and Windermere.

Rick Ripma responded that they have looked at that. He said that they have looked at everything. He said that they see communities come in all the time.

Rick Ripma called for any other comments.

Seeing none, Rick Ripma closed the public hearing.

Rick Ripma called for Staff comments.

Angie Conn said that she wanted to address some of the points in the Department Report. She said that Matt Griffin forwarded her an email from the Urban Forester, Scott Brewer stating that he had received the

landscape plans on October 25, 2005 and that because this is one of his busiest times of the year, he has not had a chance to review them yet. She said that she was forwarded an email from Greg Hoyes with the Hamilton County Surveyor's Office. She said that he addressed the issue of the retention ponds affecting the water table or the wells in his email. She said that it was his position that the wells would not be affected at all. She said that another email from Greg Hoyes said that he wanted to see some changes in the plat to see the property line stop at the top of the bank and, then, a fifteen-foot easement. She said that with those outstanding issues, the Department is recommending that this item be continued to the December 6, 2005 meeting pending review of the landscape plan and changes in the plat pursuant to the comments of Greg Hoyes.

Rick Ripma called for questions and comments from the Committee.

Susan Westermeier asked if the Surveyor was looking at the first plan or the second plan.

Steve Wilson said that the Hamilton County Surveyor's office had looked at both plans. He said that they had approval on both sets of plans. He said that Scott Brewer also had both sets of plans.

Susan Westermeier said that there were concerns from homeowners on the West side last time about the tree line. She said that she wanted to know what had been done with regards to those comments.

Brian Robinson said that they had filled in the blank spots in the Western tree line with October Glory Maples and Red Buds.

Rick Ripma asked what caliper.

Brian Robinson responded that he thought two, but wasn't sure.

Dianna Knoll clarified that they were deciduous trees, so they would lose their leave for the winter.

Brian Robinson said that Scott had some issues with tree preservation. He said that they have provided a ten-foot tree preservation area on the West side and South end of the property. He said that the picture that they have included in the Committee packet basically reflect the tree line that is going to stay there. He said that they can only preserve, per the ordinance, trees that have a ten-inch caliper. He said that they cannot count anything else. He referred to the photos in the Committee packets and noted that the tree line was very nice and that they were not going to be disturbing any of that, but rather would be adding to it.

Steve Wilson said that they wanted to save as many trees as possible to buffer other neighborhoods.

Brian Robinson added that the petitioners felt very comfortable that by the time the petitioners get to Plan Commission in a few weeks that all landscape issues would be taken care of. He said that he felt that would be adequate time to get the landscape approval from Scott Brewer. He said that as far as Greg Hoyes's comments on the existing pond. He said that basically there is a bank issue in that the lots don't touch the water, but that Greg Hoyes wants the lots pulled back with a fifteen-foot easement around. Mr. Robinson stated that the petitioner had no problem doing that whatsoever. He said that the letter Greg Hoyes faxed to him said that all of these issues could be taken care of in the construction plans. He said that if it is an exhibit of something the Committee would like to see at Plan Commission, then he said that would be fine. Rick Ripma clarified that Greg Hoyes was asking for an easement, not changing the lot sizes, but putting in a

fifteen-foot regulated drainage easement.

Brian Robinson said that one of Greg Hoyes's comments was that they need to make the existing pond safe and make it more towards the ordinance standards. He said that is also fine, but that they would have to wait for an analysis to take place during construction planning. He said that they might have to pull the banks back a little or put a safety ledge in there. He said that his company was going to do what they needed to accommodate Greg Hoyes with regards to the pond issues.

Rick Ripma said that last time, the petitioner had mentioned that the pond was a wetland and that they were unable to touch it.

Brian Robinson said that it is considered a wetland. He said that the petitioner's could not touch anything inside the water.

Kevin Heber asked how many homeowners Jeff Scripture represented.

Susan Westermeier responded nine.

Kevin Heber asked if there was a Homeowner's Association.

Steve Wilson said that there was an active Homeowner's Association.

Kevin Heber noted that they were not being represented or making any statements.

Steve Wilson said that he could represent them and say that they were for the original plan.

Kevin Heber clarified that Steve Wilson controls the Homeowner's Association.

Steve Wilson stated that he controls the Homeowner's Association.

Discussion ensued about where the drainage would discharge with regards to the wetland area.

Dianna Knoll asked if there was going to be any impact from the petitioner's design to the existing wetland area.

Brian Robinson clarified that from the design there would be no impact on the wetland whatsoever.

Steve Wilson commented that with the first design that they did, there would be no impact either. He said it would be the same situation.

Dianna Knoll asked why the Department was recommending the item be tabled to December 6.

Angie Conn responded that it was part of the new policy where we are being more strict with people not getting things to us on time. Angie Conn stated that the Urban Forester would have to re-review the landscape plans since the entire plat changed. She reminded the Committee that there was also an issue with adding an easement. She said that if the Committee did not see it as an issue, they had the liberty to go ahead and vote on the project.

Susan Westermeier asked how the entrance lined up with the entrance to Kingsmill.

Steve Wilson said that the wetland area makes it impossible for the entrance to the proposed subdivision to line up with Kingsmill.

Brian Robinson said that he has an email from Mike McBride from the Hamilton County Highway Department and the Staff should also have an email saying that he is satisfied with the design, though it is not his ideal situation, this is the only location the petitioner can put this entrance.

Steve Wilson said it was still a dangerous intersection.

Kevin Heber asked what the speed limit was on 106th Street in that area.

Rick Ripma said that he wanted to know what the landscape plan was for the area where there was a 60-foot shortage on the 200-feet required separation from collector streets on lot one.

Steve Wilson said there would be a seven-foot wall with eight-foot tall columns. He said that they would mound it and put some landscaping to give it buffer. He said that the reason for that it is because the lots are not as deep as he preferred, so he said that he made them ten feet wider, so the people could stretch the houses out a little bit more.

Rick Ripma called for any additional questions.

Dianna Knoll said that she feels that the petitioner has come back with the two entrances and accesses that the Committee asked for at the last meeting, landscaping given that it will be consistent with Windsor Grove I and the easements. She said that she would see no reason why they couldn't make an action on it tonight.

Dianna Knoll said that the Committee did not need the Subdivision waiver for points of access in the motion.

Dianna Knoll made formal motion to send Docket Number 05080016 PP: Windsor Grove II and 05080017 Subdivision Waiver 6.03.19 back to the full Plan Commission with a favorable recommendation subject to the approval of the landscape plan by the Urban Forester, and showing the fifteen foot easement on the plans.

Kevin Heber seconded the motion.

The motion **carried 4-0 with the conditions as stated.**

John Molitor noted that the Committee still had a waiver request sitting there. He said that it either needed to be withdrawn by the petitioner, be forwarded back to the Plan Commission with an unfavorable recommendation. He said that technically they could request the waiver at any time and that they could come back with a plan that doesn't show it.

Steve Wilson said that he really doesn't want to withdraw it.

Rick Ripma said that the Committee would vote on it.

Dianna Knoll made formal motion to send 05080018 Subdivision Waiver 6.03.21 Points of Access to full

Plan Commission with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was **denied with zero (0) in favor and four (4) opposed.**

...END...

4. Docket No. 05090009 PP: Five Star Estates

The applicant seeks to plat 5 lots on 5 acres.

The site is located at 2200 W. 131st Street and is zoned S1/Residential.

Filed by Greg Snelling of Snelling Engineering, LLC for Prime Lots, LLC.

Present for the Petitioner: Greg Snelling with Snelling Engineering and Dilip Patel of 3568 Corsham Circle.

Petitioner's Presentation: Greg Snelling said that he and the petitioner were there to present a primary plat for five lots on five acres at 2200 West 131st Street. He said that the petition was before the Plan Commission a couple of weeks ago and that they meet the S-1 zoning and Subdivision Control Ordinance in all aspects. He said that they were at the Committee to discuss two issues that the Plan Commission wanted the petitioner to resolve. He said that the first issue was the entrance. He noted that the Committee booklet had some photos of the type of entrance that the petitioner envisioned and photos of some of the homes that Mr. Patel has built in Carmel. He said that the proposed subdivision is five lots on one cul-de-sac that is around five hundred feet. He said that the petitioner would be building \$800,000 to \$1,000,000 homes or more.

Mr. Patel said that he was planning to live in the subdivision. He said that his own home would be built in this subdivision.

Greg Snelling said that in the past couple of weeks they had developed a detailed landscaping plan for which they had received approval from Scott Brewer on. He presented a graphic of the landscaping plan. He said that the plans showed the buffer yard landscaping and noted that each individual lot would have specific landscaping requirements also.

Mr. Patel said that the requirements would be a tree every fifty feet.

Greg Snelling said that they had also developed a more detailed scale drawing of the proposed entrance with the brick wall and signage. He said that it would be black, anodized aluminum with the appearance of wrought iron ornamental fence across the frontage. He presented building material samples to the Committee.

He noted that for the most part the petitioners had received approval from the Urban Forester on the landscaping plan and from the City Engineer's office as of today, so he said that he was not sure that there were any issues.

Rick Ripma called for comments from the public.

Seeing none, he called for Staff comments.

Angie Conn said that the Department Report says that at the last meeting an adjacent property owner had requested that a fence be installed along the Western boundary. She noted that for lots four and five they must be 120 feet wide at the building line and it must be shown. All comments have been resolved with the City Engineer. She said that the landscape plan has partially been approved. She noted that Scott Brewer needs a

plan that shows the utility easements and drainage easements, so that he can verify that there are no conflicts with the landscaping. She said that has yet to be submitted. She said that with that outstanding issue, the department is requesting that the Committee continue this request to December 6, 2005.

Rick Ripma called for Committee comments.

Dianna Knoll asked if there would be anything in writing or a document that would be provided to the home buyers so that they would understand that the cul-de-sac would not be limited to just their use.

Greg Snelling responded that it would be in the covenants and restrictions for the subdivision that if a developer to the West wanted to access that drive that

Mr. Patel said that he is an engineer himself. He said that he approached the property owner to the West about possibly purchasing and including their land in this subdivision. Mr. Patel said that property owner didn't want to do anything. He said that he was going to connect the road to the West.

Dianna Knoll said that her concern was with the five lots that are to be sold. She said that what happens is that the homeowners get angry later on because they didn't know about the stub street going in, etc.

Greg Snelling said that there will be commitments that will run with the land that say that the common area will be maintained by the Homeowner's Association and, then, there will be commitments in the plat that the stub street easement will be vacated later. He said that when the homeowners purchase their lots, they would be subject to the covenants and restrictions of the subdivision, which are subject to the commitments for the plat approval. He said that he believes that would be the way it would be done legally.

Discussion ensued about what possible developments might be probable on the property to the West of the proposed subdivision.

Greg Snelling said that the petitioner has to have a five foot buffer yard. He said that the neighbor that is living on the West said that he didn't want to see the back of the houses. He also noted that the petitioner has agreed to the fence.

Susan Westermeier asked what type of fencing material that would be.

Greg Snelling responded that it would be wrought iron ornamental.

Susan Westermeier asked if it was sufficient for them to say that they would build a five hundred foot fence.

Angie Conn said that the Committee could either have that put in the Commitments or as a condition upon approval.

Susan Westermeier asked if Staff needed to go back and review that or if they were okay with that.

Angie Conn said that no additional review would be necessary.

Greg Snelling commented that if the petitioners had one less lot, they would not even need to be at Plan Commission because they would be considered a minor subdivision.

Angie Conn said that the petitioner would still have the same process even for a minor subdivision.

Rick Ripma asked if there was any issue on lot one with the two hundred foot setback requirement.

Greg Snelling said that it wasn't a secondary plat yet, but that it could be whatever the Committee needed it to be.

Dianna Knoll noted that it was two hundred feet.

Discussion ensued about the building line of lot one and how it related to the two hundred foot requirement.

Angie Conn said that she would look into that.

Rick Ripma said that he just wanted to make sure that it was okay there.

Kevin Heber said that it was a pretty unique design of the cul-de-sac. He said that he wasn't sure that it really fit in with what was already there.

Dilip Patel said that the homeowner didn't want to sell his property. He said that the property owner negotiated with Brenwick who wasn't interested because it was too small of a property. He said that he decided to buy it to build on it.

Rick Ripma pointed out that the site was only five acres and that there really wasn't anywhere else to go.

Greg Snelling said that there isn't really any other way to redesign the subdivision.

Rick Ripma pointed out that when there is a petition that meets all of the ordinances, the Committee doesn't have many options.

Kevin Heber said that he wouldn't say that there were no options.

Discussion ensued regarding possible ways that the site could be redesigned.

Greg Snelling said that Scott Brewer's email basically, without quoting it, said that the landscaping plan was okay for primary plat approval because the petitioner will have to come back with a final set of landscaping plans and details for the secondary plat approval. He said that the petitioner would like to respectfully request that the Committee vote tonight.

Rick Ripma said that he saw no reason why the Committee could not vote tonight.

Dianna Knoll made formal motion to send Docket number 05090009 PP: Five Star Estates to the full Plan Commission with a favorable recommendation subject to the fencing on the Western boundary, the petitioner granting access to the cul-de-sac street should future development take place to the West with verbiage in the Covenants and Restrictions to that effect, and complete approval of the landscape plan by the Urban Forester, Scott Brewer.

Susan Westermeier seconded the motion.

The motion was **APPROVED 4-0**.

...END...

5. Docket No. 05080040 DP Amend/ADLS: West Carmel Center, Blk C, lot 1 - Maplecrest Commons

The applicant seeks site plan and building approval for a business/retail center. The site is just west of Commerce Dr. & Carwinion Wy. and is zoned B-3/Business within the US 421 Overlay. Filed by Mike Jett of American Consulting for PR Block C, LLC.

Present for the Petitioner: Craig May with PR Block C, LLC., Steve Hanscom, Alen Fetahagic, and Rod Pizarro all with American Consulting, Inc.

Petitioner's Presentation: Alen Fetahagic said that the project had already been to the Plan Commission meeting and that they were sent to the Special Studies Committee meeting. He said that there were two main issues to be addressed. He said that those were the landscape plan and the lighting plan. He said that he believed that both concerns were addressed. He said that the landscape plan has been approved by both the Urban Forester, Scott Brewer and by the Homeowner's Association of the adjacent subdivision. He said that the petitioner had also provided revised lighting plan and that he believed the staff had changed its recommendation because they received the revised lighting plan.

Rick Ripma called for comments from the public. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing.

Rick Ripma called for comments from the Staff.

Angie Conn said that all concerns had been addressed and that the Department recommended that the Committee forward the request to the full Plan Commission.

Dianna Knoll said that she saw that the petitioner should submit building materials, colors, and samples to the Committee for review.

Rod Pizarro presented the samples and elevations to the Committee. He noted that the colors were the same as Binford Place. He said that the majority was brick with two different brick colors.

Rick Ripma asked if the Committee had a lighting plan.

Alen Fetahagic said that it should be in the booklets.

Rick Ripma said that the Committee would like to see the updated lighting plan. He asked the petitioner if there was anything else updated that they would want to see.

The petitioner said that the landscape plan had also been updated.

Discussion ensued relating to the changes that had been made on the lighting and landscaping plans.

Rick Ripma asked what the dimensions of the parking spaces were.

The petitioners responded that most of them were 20 feet by 9 feet. They said that they think there may be a few which got reduced to 18 feet x 10 feet.

Rick Ripma asked Angie Conn what the code on it was.

Angie Conn responded that the parking space had to total 180 square feet. She said that if it was on the perimeter it could have a two-foot overhang over the curb.

Dianna Knoll made formal motion to send Docket number 05080040 DP Amend./ADLS : West Carmel Center, Block C, Lot 1-Maplecrest Commons back to full Plan Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Susan Westermeier seconded the motion.

The motion was **APPROVED 4-0**.

...END...

6. Docket No. 05090002 OA: ROSO Repeal

The applicant seeks to Repeal the Subdivision Control Ordinance, *Chapter 7: Open Space Standards for Major Subdivisions (ROSO III)*, in order to repeal the ROSO subdivision standards.

Filed by the Carmel Department of Community Services.

Present for the Petitioner: Adrienne Keeling and Mike Hollibaugh representing the Carmel Department of Community Services.

Petitioner's Presentation: She said that the Committee might recall that last month there was some confusion over the direction of where this might go given the fact that this issue was sent down from the Carmel City Council. She said that after getting further clarification, it seems that the City certainly doesn't want to repeal Chapter seven of the Subdivision Control Ordinance completely. She said that it seems that the problem is really with the density bonuses that are going along with some of the subdivisions. She said that the Department has submitted to the Committee a revised draft that shows section 7.02 Subdivision Density Incentives as the section to be deleted. She said that was basically the formula, which increases the density allowed over and above the base density based on increased amounts of open space provided in the subdivision. She said that the City Council has given the direction that the densities are really what is the problem and that section specifically should be deleted from this chapter.

Dianna Knoll asked if the direction of the City Council was that the chapter should be totally deleted regardless whether the developer has put in more open space or not. She asked if there was going to be less open space now.

Adrienne Keeling responded that there would still be the required open space in section 7.01 in the S-1's fifteen percent and all the way up to twenty-five percent in R-5. She said that this would decrease any density bonus based on anything over and above the standard open space.

Rick Ripma said that his guess was that it would decrease the open space.

Dianna Knoll said that she guessed they wouldn't see anything over the fifteen percent.

Discussion ensued regarding the affect the repeal would have on the base densities.

Adrienne Keeling suggested ratcheting down the exemption on page one. She said that section 7.00.03 it states that major subdivisions with a gross density of one unit per acre or less shall be exempt from the requirements of this chapter. She said that if the City has required in S-1 a base density of 1.0 and eliminated any density bonus, then she said anything at 1.0, according to the change, would be exempt. She said that what she is saying is if they lower the exemption so that .5 units per acre or 1 per 2 acres, there are some subdivisions now that are one unit per acre now or less that don't have to have any open space.

Rick Ripma clarified that by ratcheting down the down the density, then the subdivisions would be required to have open space again.

Dianna Knoll said that the Committee is actually doing more than the City Council has asked.

Susan Westermeier asked what brought this on.

Adrienne Keeling said that a lot of the higher density subdivisions, particularly in the Western part of the Township, brought on Mark's request last Spring to ratchet down the base densities in the S-1 areas all to 1.0 and, subsequently, there have still been a few projects which have come through which still do not have densities which satisfy Rick Sharp. She said that this amendment came through Rick Sharp and he is still not satisfied with the densities mostly because the City of Carmel comprehensive plan is getting some age on it and he said that he would like everything to comply with the comprehensive plan or if they don't, they would have to rezone and take it before the City Council. She said that it is based upon principle that the comprehensive plan's numbers were set out were being increased by subdivision plats. She said that the Staff gave the Committee a spreadsheet at the last meeting, which showed that a lot of the highest density projects were, in fact, legislative decisions.

Dianna Knoll asked if the City Council got a copy of that spreadsheet.

Adrienne Keeling responded that the City Council did get a copy of it and she said that it did clarify a little bit. She said that only Abney Glen and Yorktown Woods have gone through since the March revision. She said that Abney Glen had a net density of 1.08 and it's an S-1. She said that Yorktown Woods had a net density of 2.66 and it is an R-1.

Discussion ensued about the densities of recent subdivisions in the area and clarification of how the repeal would affect a subdivision and how the densities are calculated.

John Molitor suggested that if the Committee would like to introduce some symmetry to this, he said that Committee might consider .85. He said he offered that suggestion because the ordinance requires 15 % open space.

Discussion ensued relating to clarifying what the staff position on it is and the process of responding to the

City Council's directive.

Dianna Knoll said that she hates to lose the efforts that the City has made with subdivisions for community feeling and shared spaces. She said that she feels that speaks with the spirit of what they've been doing.

Rick Ripma asked for any further comments or concerns.

Susan Westermeier said that she thought the Committee should discuss the variable that they were going to use.

Rick Ripma said that he felt that they should use .85.

Dianna Knoll made formal motion to send Docket number 05090002 OA: ROSO Repeal to the full Plan Commission, which is limited to removing section 7.02 and changing the units per acre in section 7.00.03 to .85 units per acre or less.

Susan Westermeier seconded the motion.

The motion was **APPROVED 4-0**.

...END...

7. Docket No. 05100008 CPA: Comp Plan Amendment – Civic Design Policies

The applicant seeks to amend the Carmel/Clay Comprehensive Plan in order to add Civic Design policies.

Filed by the Carmel Department of Community Services.

Present for the Petitioner: Adrienne Keeling and Mike Hollibaugh representing the Carmel Department of Community Services.

Petitioner's Presentation: Adrienne Keeling said that this was before the Plan Commission at the regular Plan Commission on October 18, 2005. She said at that meeting there were many, many questions raised about what this is and its intent. She said that she tried to outline several of those questions that were raised in a report to the Committee members. She asked the Committee if there were any questions or general comments about the principles in general. She said that after those concerns were addressed, they could get into how they dealt with that in procedure.

Rick Ripma said that he is having trouble understanding a couple of things. He said that there are a lot of things in the document, which say the health, safety, and comfort of pedestrians should take priority over the basic convenience of the automobile. He said that it is not an "automobile", but rather an "automobile Driver". He said that he also wonders how often people will actually get out and walk around. He said that we are in Indiana. He said that in Clay Terrace in the summer there, people drive there, park, run in and run out and, then they leave. He said that there are very few people walking around and he said that he sees a very good reason that they went from open places like that to malls. He said that he understands some of it. He said that maybe if they build places where people can live there, maybe those people who live there will get out and walk around. He said that he believes that will happen. He asked if they could put enough people living in a certain area to support the businesses and industry that is going to be there. He said that he has real

trouble understanding how Carmel is really going to get a volume of people walking around. He said that he thinks that it's like buying a four-wheel drive vehicle for three days of snow.

Adrienne Keeling responded that this plan is only focusing on the central core of Carmel. She said that she thinks the Committee will see as more and more petitions come in, and with the town home living, she said that there really will be a mass of people here. She said that certainly the intent is not to build roads any less safe for automobiles, but to give those that might want to ride their bike, take a walk, or go get their groceries on foot an option. She said that the City does a pretty good job right now of building sidewalks and paths, but she said that the City just wants to emphasize that and keep that at the front of your minds as the Plan Commission reviews and approves projects.

Rick Ripma said that the document says that they are first. He said that he absolutely disagrees with that. He doesn't think that they are any less important than the car, but the person in the car is as important as the pedestrian. He said that this is his opinion.

Dianna Knoll said that she thinks the leap is going from a suburban town to a more urban area. She said that the vision has to be there. She said that who knows the timing.

Rick Ripma said there have been a lot of visions that didn't work.

Dianna Knoll said that without a vision nothing will work. She said that she thinks that the vision is for the core city, not for West Clay. She said that she, for one, should have lived in New York, Paris, or some other big metropolitan area. She said that he kids and family won't go. She said that she thinks that there is some place in between there and where Carmel is today. She said that the culture in Indiana is such that we are the fattest state in the country. She said that until we get past everyone getting in the car and driving, she said she thinks it is just a major health issue. She said that she is all for it. She said that she thinks it is well done. She said that her only issue is how to get from where Carmel is now to the next step.

Kevin Heber said that he is completely sold too. He said that he understands what Rick is saying, but he said that he thinks that the answer to that is if people want to drive, he thinks that there are plenty of perimeter locations to shop at. He said that he thinks that this vision is going to implement something that is just a really nice place to be and to live and to do things small scale. He said it is a movement away from the big box shopping. He said that he thinks that if you look through there, the fifteen-minute walk is the standard. He said that if you are able to do something in fifteen minutes it's a more compelling case. He said that people will do that.

Rick Ripma said that some people would do that. He said that Wal-Mart is very successful because more people will drive to Wal-Mart. He said that his biggest objection to the plan is that the pedestrian is more important than the driver of the car. He said that it may just be the way it was written. He said that he just doesn't like the fact that when you get someone who is an academic and they come up with a vision, rarely does that vision work that he's seen. He said they get these great visions, but they do not work in practicality. He said that they have to get out in the world and actually see them work.

Kevin Heber said that there are actually places where this does work. He said that to be a really competitive and cutting edge place to live, this plan is clearly the way to do things.

Dianna Knoll said that Carmel has a huge brain drain and a huge empty nester drain from this area. She asked

why the people are leaving the community. She said that it was because they couldn't feel a sense of community. She said that they don't feel connected enough. She said that they are all living in a two parent, 2.5 kids, a dog and a cat on a half-acre lot driving four cars parked in the driveway. She said that this has been the only fit for Carmel for a long time. She said that she thinks it is exemplary that the vision is moving outside the box and that the residents of Carmel do not have to be the 30-50 year old couple with the kids. She said that there is a life cycle issue here, which she said she thinks is good. She asked where the kids who just get married go. She said that they don't come to Carmel because they can't afford it. She said they have to go to Noblesville. She asked where the people who waitress and the people who work the service jobs live. She said that they can't afford to live where they work.

Rick Ripma asked if implementing this plan was going to make Carmel affordable.

Dianna Knoll responded that she thinks so because of the density.

Rick Ripma said that the town homes that the Plan Commission has approved have been \$200,000-\$300,000. He commented that that wasn't affordable for a waitress.

Kevin Heber said that more than that; it would be a demographic thing. He said that it would most likely be the ages. He said that ages 25-35 are the "creative class". He said that it is the age that makes cities successful from a quality of life standpoint. He said that has been studied. He said it was the whole Richard Florida thing. He said that he has read a lot about him. He said that the idea is that the most desirable places to live in the United States have this strong "creative class" element. He said that he has just recently watched the schools' presentation on channel 16. He said that there was a big dip in the age range of 25-35 years olds. He said that was the biggest gap in the community.

Rick Ripma said there is a dip because there are not as many of them. He said that he looks at demographics all the time because of advertising. He said that there is a dip because there are not as many people in the 25-35 year old age range.

Kevin Heber said that the plan proposed was attempting to make it a more attractive place to live.

Rick Ripma said he is not saying that this plan wouldn't make it a more attractive place to live. He said that he likes the vision. He said that he has trouble thinking that Carmel is going to look at mass transit. He said to ask Noblesville how their mass transit worked.

Susan Westermeier said there are different types of mass transit.

Dianna Knoll asked Rick what his thoughts on it were and what he thought the Committee should do with the plan at this point.

Rick Ripma said that he wants to know what the Committee thinks. He said that the reality of people in Indiana is that we don't get outside when it is cold and we don't get outside when it is hot.

Susan Westermeier said that just because people don't do that doesn't mean that they will never do that. She said that's all the proposed plan is saying that here is a concept and a vision. She said that she was in Vancouver this summer. She said it is freezing up there in the winter, but she said that everyone is out.

Rick Ripma said that we see our neighbors everyday in the summer. He said the winter comes and for six months they do not see their neighbors. He said we don't go outside.

Susan Westermeier asked Rick if he was saying that because we don't, we never will.

Rick Ripma responded that he was saying that it would be a matter of changing public opinion.

Susan Westermeier said that she felt that the proposed plan was one of the ways to accomplish that.

Rick Ripma said he doesn't disagree with this plan, but he just wants to make sure that the Committee is doing the right thing. He said that he doesn't even know what the Committee is supposed to do with the proposed plan once they do talk about it.

Kevin Heber said that he viewed the proposed plan as a guide. He said that it would be helpful to have it to point to when reviewing plans.

Rick Ripma commented that most of it is already in the overlay.

Susan Westermeier commented that this was not a final draft.

Rick Ripma asked what happens with the proposed plan.

Adrienne Keeling said that the proposed plan certainly would not negate what was on the books right now as far as zoning ordinance.

Rick Ripma said he didn't read any hard facts in the proposed plan. He said it was all very soft. He said that the only other issue that he had personally was the transit thing. He said that he can't see how Carmel could have a bus that just runs around the inner city. He said that he thinks that if Carmel could get something that goes to Indianapolis at some point, if it didn't cost the taxpayers too much, he said that he thinks that would make sense. He said that he would be hard pressed to ever want to vote for something that supported buses. He said that the bus system in the City of Indianapolis, as large as it is, is failing. He said that Noblesville tried a bus service and it failed. He said that he doesn't see any way that Carmel is even close to that.

Adrienne said that Carmel needs to be prepared for the regional transit plans that Indianapolis and the MPO is working on. She said that the thought behind the mobile city section of Civic Design was to think even farther out than the regional system. She said that one day, when the density and population in the core is a lot greater than it is right now, it may be a perfectly acceptable way of moving around the core of Carmel. She said that the proposed plan is really meant to get the big ideas out there.

Discussion ensued about transit options besides the automobile.

Rick Ripma said that Indiana has not proven to be a place that will carpool let alone use buses. He said that those are the facts of today. He said that his problem with putting a bus pull off in is that if you have a bus pull off, then you have to have a bus to pull off there. So, he said that you better get a bus because the City has all these bus pull offs in. He said that he sees this as so far down the road and he said that public opinion will have to change. He said that the reality is that the bus system in Indianapolis is failing because people will not ride it. He said that it doesn't matter that gas went to \$3.00 per gallon, people didn't ride it. He said

that it may be viable down the road. He said that he really has a problem with mass transit because he doesn't want someone deciding that we need buses and spending a bunch of our tax dollars on buses and later on they've just blown millions and millions of our tax dollars.

Discussion ensued about how regional transit affects economic development.

Rick Ripma said that if Carmel got a transit line to Indianapolis, they would have to have a large parking lot there because everyone would drive there. He said that he wanted to know what the objective for the proposed plan was and what the Committee was supposed to do with it.

Discussion ensued about the procedure the Committee should use to respond.

Carol Schleiss said that she was an architect in the area and she said that used to live in Seattle and grew up in L.A. She said that she has seen first hand the importance of thinking ahead and that she feels that Seattle and L.A. missed the boat in several areas. She said L.A. is finally putting in some subways, but that it is way too late. She said that Carmel has an opportunity here to really think ahead and get ahead of the game and to not make those mistakes. She noted that she is helping Indianapolis with their regional plan. She said that they keep comparing Seattle to Indianapolis because of the population, but she said Seattle has a much higher density because half of Seattle is under water and Seattle has huge lakes and mountains. She said that Seattle is dealing with issues there where mixed use is everywhere because of the density. She said that Seattle has inexpensive lofts. She said that she thinks the real thing with this proposed plan is that the staff is trying to urge the Commission and Committee to think ahead and she said that rapid transit is a real idea that needs to be entertained.

Kevin Heber said that when he moved to Carmel he was just ready to get out. He said that he was just ready to move somewhere else like Seattle. He said that the reason that he stuck around was because he saw the City doing some really neat things, like the library and the downtown area. He said that he saw that Carmel really was evolving into a really unique place. He said that it is not a suburb, but rather it is a city in itself.

Dianna Knoll said that Carmel is never going to have weather. She said that Helsinki doesn't have weather, but they have some pretty exciting things in the Scandinavian countries that encourage some outdoor aspect of the full health spectrum.

Rick Ripma noted that downtown Carmel was built in the late 1800's and early 1900's. He noted that the buildings are right on the street plus the sidewalks. He asked why the way they build the buildings had changed. He said that was how they used to build things. He noted the automobile changed the way we built things. He said that the automobile has not gone away.

Kevin Heber said that society changed too much and accommodated too much for the automobile and he noted that now we are wiser.

Rick Ripma said that something he finds interesting is that people move out to California and Seattle and all that, but he asked where they come when they have families. He said that they move to Carmel and to Indiana and to the Midwest. He said that they move here because of our values.

Dianna Knoll said that she thinks that they used to, but she said that she is not sure that they still would.

Rick Ripma said that statistically there are huge movements back.

Susan Westermeier asked what the Committee was doing with the document.

Adrienne Keeling said that she didn't see that anyone was opposed to the document, although she noted that Rick Ripma had some issues with it. She said that she felt that to adopt it as a full-blown Comprehensive Plan amendment might be a little bit strong. She said that the intent of it was for the folks reviewing the plans and making the decisions to look at it as a guide. She said that she thought they should maybe adopt it with some sort of cover letter or memo attached to it. She said that certain parts of the document could translate right into ordinance amendments and certain parts of it can translate right into the framework of Carmel's Comprehensive Plan. She said that staff is currently in the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan for Carmel. She said that Staff is looking for a way that the Commission can endorse the plan and use it as a guide for principles for the central core without getting down to the specificity.

John Molitor said that if the Committee has reservations about adopting the plan as a document that's on the same level as the existing Comprehensive Plan, he said that the Committee could direct the staff to compose a cover letter that indicated that the document was for guiding design principles. He said that it should be a letter that states where it sits in regard to the Comprehensive Plan and that it is not intended to supercede the Comprehensive Plan, but rather that it is a subordinate document. He said it only had to be a short paragraph or two to clarify that, but it would still entitle it to be looked at when someone wants to do a PUD or something like that in the future.

Susan Westermeier said that the Committee was a black and white group that votes yes or no. She said that she didn't see that the Staff had given the Committee anything to vote yes or no on. She asked Staff to come back to the Committee with how they wanted to use it and she said that the Committee could vote yes or no on that.

Adrienne Keeling said that she is getting that everyone is, generally, in favor of the intent of the document. She said that it all started with the City Council saying that it was good and that the Council wanted to resolve that the Staff move forward with some of these things.

Susan Westermeier directed the staff to come back to the Committee with how they wanted to implement the document and its content. Dianna Knoll and Rick Ripma agreed.

...END...

Rick Ripma adjourned the meeting at 8:44p.m.

Subdivision Committee Chair - Rick Ripma

Respectfully Submitted By: Laura Rouse-DeVore